

REMARKS

Reexamination and reconsideration of the application as amended are requested. Support for the amended claims is found, for example, from figures 1-3 and from the original claims.

The examiner's rejection of claims 1, 3-14, 19 and 21 as "obvious", under 35 USC 103, is respectfully traversed. The examiner rejects these claims as being unpatentable over Gillam (US 2004/0051894) in view of Manico (US 7,170,557). Claims 3-14 and 21 depend from claim 1.

Claims 1 and 19 each require that the first and second operator panels 14 and 16 each serve only as a user interface with the machine controller electronics 18 to selectively activate the machine controller electronics 18 to enable the machine 10 to function as at least one (and a different one) of the at least two different devices. The operator panel 12 of Gillam additionally serves to transmit image data to the machine 10, when the recorder 20 of the operator panel of Gillam does not contain a photo card in a digital camera such as when the recorder 20 is an electronic microscope, a CAT scanner, an X-ray camera, etc. (see paragraph [0022] of Gillam), contrary to the requirements of applicants' claims 1 and 19. It is noted that the examiner cited Manico only to make the operator panels of Gillam directly physically engagable with the machine.

Claim 3 requires that the first operator panel 14 cannot convey image data to the machine 10. With respect to this claim, the examiner apparently considers the user interface 36 of Gillam to be the first operator panel. User interface 36 of Gillam additionally serves to convey image data from device 12 to the machine 10 (see figure 3). Also, user interface 36 of Gillam (see figure 3) is not an operator panel which is removably attachable to the machine instead of another operator panel as required by applicants' claims 1 and 19.

The examiner's rejection of claim 2 as "obvious", under 35 USC 103, is respectfully traversed. The examiner rejects these claims as being unpatentable over Gillam (US 2004/0051894) as modified by Manico (US 7,170,557) and further in view of Wegeng US

2004/0041848). Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and applicants' previous remarks concerning the patentability of claim 1 over Gillam in view of Manico are herein incorporated by reference.

Claim 2 requires that the first and second operator panels 14 and 16 each cannot record an image. With respect to this claim, the examiner apparently considers the user interface 36 of Gillam to be the first operator panel. User interface 36 of Gillam additionally serves to convey image data from device 12 to the machine 10 (see figure 3) and does not serve only as a user interface with the machine controller electronics to selectively activate the machine controller electronics to enable the machine to function as at least one of the at least two different devices, as required by applicants' claim 1. Also, user interface 36 of Gillam (see figure 3) is not an operator panel which is removably attachable to the machine instead of another operator panel as required by applicants' claim 1. Gillam's user interface 36 serves as an operator panel for "walk-up" jobs such as to scan (and copy) hard-copy originals (see paragraph [0029] of Gillam). Gillam does not need another such operator panel such as one from Wegeng. It is noted that devices 12 (detachable "operator panels") of Gillam can record an image (see paragraph [0021] of Gillam).

The examiner's rejection of claims 15, 17 and 20 as "obvious", under 35 USC 103, is respectfully traversed. The examiner rejects these claims as being unpatentable over Gillam (US 2004/0051894) in view of Wegeng US 2004/0041848). Claim 17 depends from claim 15.

Claims 15 and 20 each require a first operator panel 14 which serves only as a user interface with the machine controller electronics 18 to activate the machine controller electronics 18 to enable the machine 12 to operate as at least the facsimile device in the computer-host-based mode, and a second operator panel 16 which has operator-panel controller electronics 24 for the machine 12 to operate in the stand-alone-based mode.

The examiner identifies a first operator panel 12 of Gillam as the first operator panel. The operator panel 12 of Gillam additionally serves to transmit image data to the machine 10 contrary to the requirements of applicants' claims 15 and 20 as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 19. The examiner identifies a second operator panel 12 of Gillam as the second operator panel. The operator panel 12 of Gillam additionally serves to transmit image data to the

machine 10 contrary to the requirements of applicants' claims 15 and 20. Adapting the first operator panel 12 of Gillam to not be able to operate in the stand-alone-based mode, using the teachings of Wegeng, does nothing to overcome the fact that the operator panel 12 of Gillam additionally serves to transmit image data to the machine 10 contrary to the requirements of applicants' claims 15 and 20 as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 19.

Claims 15 and 20 additionally require that the first operator panel 14 does not source image data and that the second operator panel 16 does not source image data. Each operator panel 12 of Gillam sources image data.

The examiner's rejection of claims 16 and 18 as "obvious", under 35 USC 103, is respectfully traversed. The examiner rejects these claims as being unpatentable over Gillam (US 2004/0051894) as modified by Wegeng (US 2004/0041848), and further in view of Aoki (US 2005/0262274) and Oyanagi (US 2002/0044300). Claims 16 and 18 depend from claim 15, and applicants' previous remarks concerning the patentability of claim 15 over Gillam in view of Wegeng are herein incorporated by reference.

The examiner's rejection of claim 22 as "obvious", under 35 USC 103, is respectfully traversed. The examiner rejects these claims as being unpatentable over Gillam (US 2004/0051894) as modified by Manico (US 7,170,557), and further in view of the admitted prior art. Claim 22 depends from claim 1, and applicants' previous remarks concerning the patentability of claim 1 over Gillam as modified by Manico herein incorporated by reference.

Inasmuch as each of the rejections has been answered by the above remarks and amended claims, it is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn, and that this application be passed to issue. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees required or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0809.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas E. Erickson
Douglas E. Erickson
Reg. No. 29,530

Date: 8/25/08

Serial No.: 10/689,323
Attorney Docket No.: 2002-0611.02
Amendment

THOMPSON HINE LLP
2000 Courthouse Plaza NE
10 West Second Street
Dayton, Ohio 45402-1758
(937) 443-6814